

**WHOIS WG Meeting  
TRANSCRIPTION  
Monday 16 July 2012 at 1900 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording of WHOIS WG on the Monday 16th July 2012 at 1900 UTC. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The audio is also available at:

<http://audio.icann.org/gnso/gnso-whois-survey-wg-20120716-en.mp3>

**Attendees**

Susan Prosser - RrSG  
Michael Young - Individual  
Wilson Abigaba - RrSG  
Don Blumenthal - RySG  
Anne Naffziger - IPC  
Steve Metalitz - IPC

**ICANN Staff**

Berry Cobb  
Nathalie Peregrine

**Apology:**

Avri Doria – NCSG  
Cintra Sooknanan – ALAC  
Rafik Dammak – NCSG  
Wendy Seltzer - NCUC

Coordinator: I d like to remind all participants this conference is being recorded. If you have any objections you may disconnect at this time. You may begin.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much, (Kelly). Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. This is the Whois call on the 16th of July 2012. On the call today we have Anne Naffziger, Don Blumenthal, Susan Prosser, Wilson Abigaba, Steve Metalitz and Michael Young. We have apologies from Cintra

Sooknanan, Wendy Seltzer, Avri Doria and Rafik Dammak. From staff we have Berry Cobb and myself, Nathalie Peregrine.

And I'd like to remind all participants to please state their names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and over to you.

Michael Young: Hi, everyone. It's Michael Young speaking. Thank you for coming to the call. Today we'll get Berry to go through the agenda shortly. But in - as a starting point really what we're going to do today is go through the list of the feedback items that was so kindly, you know, worked on in between Wilson's extreme effort in putting together the sample survey and collecting the information from there and then Berry moving it into a forum - a digestible forum for us to act on. I just want to thank them.

And if anyone else was involved that I've missed then I want to thank them as well for that effort because it's painstaking but it absolutely allows us to do what we need to do today.

So we're going to be going through these and talking on them amongst ourselves in general. If we have no issues we'll decide what a recommended action is. But if there's follow up then we'll have to assign the follow up to one of us to - or maybe more than one of us to follow up on additional information we may need or in some cases if we don't have any immediate ideas or thoughts on how to solve for these.

So, Berry, do you want to take us formally through the agenda and the - actually we have no technical open action items except for this one.

Berry Cobb: That's correct. So we can really go ahead and move into the review of the comment tool unless anybody else has other agenda items to add?

Michael Young: Okay. This is exciting, guys. Once we get through this work and incorporate it we're ready to go. Some - let's go through the tools. I also want to leave,

Berry, a little - through the tool you've created - but I want to leave a little open discussion period maybe at the end before new business because I know a number of people did not go through the work of posting anything.

But at the ICANN meeting I was approached by a couple of people who had thoughts on the survey and, you know, encouraged them to post. But you know how people are, they'll often just pass that along to one of us as a group member and then not formally follow up. But some of it was interesting so we'll make sure - I'm sure that happened to others as well so I want to make sure we have a little bit open mic time, if you will, to talk about that.

Okay. But let's process the formal stuff first. So, Berry, what do you think? Should we just have you lead us through each item point and then we'll respond?

Berry Cobb: Absolutely. This is Berry, for the record. So before we get started let me just explain how I pulled in the comments from the survey tool. First and foremost there were no comments posted through the ICANN public comment tool, which is fine. We included those instructions there that they could use the survey tool itself.

So with exception at the very end of this public comment review tool that's listed in the Adobe Connect session there were some comments that I also included in here from the Webinar as well as some other emails that had passed around on comments with respect to the survey.

So in terms of extracting the comments out of the survey tool basically I just started from the top down. And anywhere there was a question that required or that the user had the option to enter in comments I reviewed through those. And if there was a comment that was specific to changing the survey itself or a suggested recommendation, typo errors, those kinds of things I pooled those comments into what you see in front of you now.

Of course there were some members or some test-takers, if you will, that left the comment as though they were really taking the survey. And if there was - if it was one of those comments that was purely in response to the survey question and not an actual change to the question I didn't pull those in.

However there were some that kind of seemed marginal so if I was in doubt I went ahead and pulled it into this tool as well just to make sure that we were covered.

So essentially the process and how we'll review through these - I think we should be able to get through these rather quickly. The total was somewhere around 60 or so in terms of the comments.

But basically we'll just start at the top. I'll read off what the comment was stating, who the person was and the tool or forum in which the comment came back. And then it's really up to the working group to state whether the working group just acknowledges the comments or whether we are going to change the survey tool or perhaps we find it out of scope for what we're trying to accomplish here.

And as we move through these I'll be taking those notes into the Word document. And at the end of the session I'll send out a revised version. Just before this call Wilson did send out the latest version from the survey tool dump. And I did pull these into the PDF that you see in front of the Adobe Connect session but I forgot to send up the revised version to the list. There were about 10 more comments that were pulled into this version.

And the only other thing that I'll state about this - certainly some of the comments are, you know, very simple ones like a particular word is misspelled or they suggest adding another option to the multiple choices that we're offering up for a particular question.

If I can make a recommendation since Wilson is on the call that as we traverse through each one of these comments and the working group agrees that a change should be made that you perform those changes on the tool in real time. But as a backup I will be recording that under the recommended action. But I think it'll be easier to maybe try to make them in real time as much as possible.

And it'll probably take us at least into the next call for us to complete the review of the comments. Wilson, I understand that it's very late for you where you re located. Perhaps maybe we can - is it possible to designate somebody as a backup in case you can t make the next call to perform the edits to the tool?

And hopefully Wilson is still connected. Can you hear us, Wilson?

Well I still show him connected. Hopefully he'll be able to respond in a little bit. Does anybody have any questions before I start off on Number 1? Seeing no hands, all right great.

So the first section is the Profile section. The other recommendation I might offer to the working group over to the right hand side is the link to the survey. And so that you can see that in real time I recommend that you log into the survey. And if you just answer the very first question in the profile that's the only required field.

And you'll be able to traverse through the entire survey so that you can see it in real time as we review through each of these comments and we'll move from there.

So the first comment that I have - this was from Thomas Rickert during our Webinar session with respect to the profile. And he stated, "Should we add a section about the survey takers expectation of Whois use? For example law

enforcement expects to use Whois information to find bad actors and defend against online abuse."

That's pretty much the scope of the comment. And does anybody have anything to say about this one?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve Metalitz. Don't we already have a question about how they use Whois or for what purposes they use it? I think that would kind of cover this.

Michael Young: That's what I was thinking, Steve. Because the very first question is the type of user so that kind of implies the use.

Steve Metalitz: But I think - wasn't there also a question where, you know, it says we use it to find out if a domain name is available or we use it to find out who's responsible...

Michael Young: Yes, it's...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: ...four or five - you're right; it's four or five in. I'm looking at it now. Which of the best describes the most beneficial use of Whois to you and your organization? This is probably - well it's not as direct as that but it's a similar type of question.

So for example the choices in it are - if you bring it up on your screen are - determine if a specific domain name is registered or available, find out the identity of a person or organization responsible for a domain name or Website, support technical operations, etcetera, etcetera, to identify the owner of a domain name for consumer protection or intellectual property protection purposes. I think this question kind of covers that issue that was raised.

Do you guys - has everyone got the survey open and see that? It's on the first page.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I agree with the comment as well. If there are no objections then basically stated that the working group feels this is covered and the recommended action is none.

Michael Young: Yes, I'm okay with that.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: I'll move onto the second line item. "Question 1," - sorry, it's in reference to Question 1 status. "This is," - I will - I should preface this right now - probably 98% or 99% of all the comments nobody listed their name. So that's why you'll see the - an unknown for the who there. But this did come from the survey tool. Chuck Gomes was the only person diligent about stating their identity.

Michael Young: That doesn't surprise me at all. I don't know - we put the other box in for people that wanted to clarify so they could use the other box to say I am primarily this type of user and secondarily another type of user. So, I don't know, I don't know that it's - really, I mean, we can add a lot of value by changing it. I think it's adequate but I defer to the group.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I do think we - if we find it necessary we can try to make that correlation if we determine that it's important to find out who it was that made this comment. To do it throughout the entire survey may be a bit tedious to do. So I would recommend that we just hold off unless we think it's necessary. And especially in the case where we may need to go back to - or try to find who that person is to get clarification.

Michael Young: I don't know that we need clarification. I guess I was suggesting that we just leave this one alone. But...

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve Metalitz. I d agree with that. I think the fact that you can check multiple boxes probably - and there's also an other category probably good enough.

Don Blumenthal: This is Don. I generally agree but let me just suggest that looking at the individual s concern about - now I've got to flip screens here - the specific issue about ICANN s status, you know, what constituency group or whatever the person might be a member of is - could the word status up there be creating an issue? Could we resolve anything by just changing that word?

Michael Young: Oh...

((Crosstalk))

Don Blumenthal: ...concerns.

Michael Young: No, you've got a point there. I didn't think of that. What could we use instead of status?

Berry Cobb: Affiliation...

Michael Young: Or interest group.

Don Blumenthal: Interest or use of Whois or...

Steve Metalitz: Yes, we could say - well one way just say best describes you. But the other one would be to say your use of Whois.

Michael Young: Yes, I like that. Describe your use of Whois.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.



((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: That's good, Don. That removes the politics from it; that's very good.

Berry Cobb: Great. So with that the first question would now state, "Which of the following terms best describes your use of Whois?"

Michael Young: Yes.

Berry Cobb: And so, Wilson, I think you can hear us. I'm not sure if you can respond back or not and typing in the chat will be fine. If you can just respond in the chat stating that you made that change in the tool just so I know that we re in sync.

Wilson Abigaba: That's fine. I will make that change on the tool.

Berry Cobb: Great, thank you.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay.

Berry Cobb: And bear with just for a second while I take some notes here. Okay the third comment is also unknown and from the survey tool. "The answers to the questions on ccTLDs and gTLDs contain an option without a label. The choice of answers should include None for both."

And to be honest I'm not sure which question - unless it's...

Steve Metalitz: This is Question 5 and 6. Maybe? Maybe one way to deal with this is to add zero as an option.

Michael Young: I just don't see anywhere in here that it says ccTLD so...

Don Blumenthal: Steve's right. It's that Question 5 and Question 6.

Michael Young: Five and six?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, again I'm looking at this document - and, Wilson, thank you for sending the link. This is the document that just has the questions and answers (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Sorry, I'm actually looking at the live survey.

Susan Prosser: Yes, so am I.

Berry Cobb: Yes, me too. And I don't see those in there. Let me...

Wilson Abigaba: Okay but...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Okay can we just...

((Crosstalk))

Wilson Abigaba: ...two things up at once.

Michael Young: Why don't we send the action item, Berry, can we see - can you take that as an action item just see if you can find what that's referring to later on? We'll come back to that.

Berry Cobb: Very good.

Michael Young: I don't want to spend, you know, the entire group's time for us trying to correlate that if I'm sure we can figure it out offline. If we find which questions are affected does anyone have any objections to - if it makes sense to add a None for us just to process that if that's the case?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I think that's the way to handle this.

Michael Young: Okay.

Don Blumenthal: Except - it's Don. Just a second. If it is referring to 5 and 6 Question Number 4 says how many or have you registered domains, yes/no. So a no answer theoretically gives the zero answer although it might be better to just cut that question and add the zero to 5 and 6. It might be cleaner.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve. I would agree with that if 5 and 6 aren't dependant on answering 4 then just - we don't really need 4. And then we say how many ccTLDs have you registered? How many gTLDs have you registered?

Michael Young: Okay we - I think everybody should open Wilson's PDF instead of looking at the survey online so that at least we're all following the same numbers.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Agreed. And so I'm concerned that these two questions aren't loaded into the live version though.

Susan Prosser: They are if you say yes but you only get displayed if you say yes to it.

Berry Cobb: Ah.

Susan Prosser: If you say no it goes beyond - it goes to Question 7 or whatever it is.

Don Blumenthal: Oh interesting.

Susan Prosser: Yes. So he's got logic in there which makes sense unless you're looking at the results which don't make sense.

Berry Cobb: All right, yes. Then definitely - this is Berry - I agree that the PDF version is much easier to review through.

Don Blumenthal: But it doesn't give you the logic which just blows up the point about getting the Question 4.

Susan Prosser: Oh maybe we don't need Question 4 because we'll just include - automatically include 5 and 6 at the get-go and let them say zero - remove the logic completely.

Berry Cobb: Okay so is that the action item?

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I would agree with that.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Okay.

Michael Young: And so...

Wilson Abigaba: Berry, could you please...

Michael Young: ...no logic on 4 and then 5 and 6 has an option of zero or none.

Wilson Abigaba: Berry, I'm writing down action items but could you also please make them down and send them through (unintelligible)?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I'm sorry, Wilson, I couldn't understand?

Wilson Abigaba: I said I'm writing down the action items but could you also please do the same. I'm (unintelligible).

Michael Young: Berry is just asking you to...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: He s just asking that you re tracking the changes as well in case he misses something.

Berry Cobb: Yes...

Wilson Abigaba: Yes please.

Berry Cobb: ...I'm making those within the recommended action fields.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay.

Michael Young: Wilson, did I have that right?

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, that's right.

Michael Young: Okay.

Susan Prosser: So, Berry, this is Susan. It also applies to Question Number 8. It is currently only displayed if you say yes to Number 4 - or is it 6 - 5, 6, 7 - I'm sorry, Question Number 7. And that's the general purpose of your registration so that logic needs to come out as well and have always displayed.

Berry Cobb: And you said that was the Question 7, yes.

Susan Prosser: Yes, Question 7; 5, 6 and 7.

Berry Cobb: Okay great.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, picking up on Number 7 we'll probably - we probably should add an N/A if we re removing the logic.

Susan Prosser: Good point.

Berry Cobb: Add an N/A for not applicable?

Don Blumenthal: Correct, yes.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. All right moving right along Comment Number 4 from the survey tool, "Whois interface and quality of information needs to be and should be improved for ease of use and accuracy and availability of information."

This is Berry. I think that this is probably one that's kind of in general to Whois and not so much the survey tool.

Michael Young: Yes this is just somebody, I guess, offering their opinion on Whois in general.

Don Blumenthal: It's Don. I agree.

Michael Young: Okay so no action, Berry?

Berry Cobb: Correct. Okay, Comment Number 5 from the survey tool for the question, "Which of these best describes the most beneficial use of Whois to you or your organization besides determining if a domain is available we primarily use Whois and automated used for managing domain names for ourselves and our clients specifically to determine when domains we are managing for them with various registrars are expected to expire and whether any similar names they have identified for us to watch have gone into redemption or pending delete status."

Susan Prosser: So maybe an option should be to - this is Susan - to include the ability to monitor current domain portfolio and/or available domains or something to that effect?

Michael Young: Isn't that - we kind of cover this on a couple of the other ones. But I guess not as - not cleanly enough.

Susan Prosser: Not specifically about maintaining their current portfolio. This is more about trying to find new or managing against some sort of behavior.

Michael Young: So what about a line that says, you know, to monitor domains or groups of domains for expiration and creation - sorry - for attribute and information such as creation and expiration, etcetera.

Susan Prosser: That would cover the second part of their comment but the first part was maintain their own portfolio that's used to make sure that they don't drop that's basically what they're saying.

Michael Young: Yes but that's...

((Crosstalk))

Susan Prosser: ...gets to be the same point, you're right. That could be the same point...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: ...domains, right?

Susan Prosser: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. What if we just said - gave an option of, to manage a domain name portfolio for self or others?

Susan Prosser: That works too.

Michael Young: I'd rather say group of domains, Steve, because portfolio can get - can upset some people.

Susan Prosser: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: Manage...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: You know?

Steve Metalitz: ...a group of domain for self or others.

Michael Young: Yes, a group of domains for self or on behalf of others. And, you know, I hate to be finicky about the language but we should say group of domains versus portfolio.

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

Wilson Abigaba: How about - this is Wilson. How about (unintelligible) further so that (unintelligible).

Michael Young: We should probably have an other but I think this tag line would be common enough use case that we should include it.

Anne Naffziger: Yes, this is Anne. I do agree though, this does prompt us to consider there may be other possibilities we haven't thought of. So perhaps - I agree - perhaps an other added here as well would make sense.

Michael Young: Yes. So can we do both - the extra line and another?

Anne Naffziger: I think that makes sense.

Berry Cobb: And - this is Berry. So for the new option the language on that is to monitor and manage groups of domains for expiration.

Steve Metalitz: I don't know if it was limited to expiration but to monitor...



((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...group of domains for self or on behalf of others. There might be...

Michael Young: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: ...there are other things besides expiration that would be involved.

Michael Young: Yes, yes, just manage group of domains and noting it could be for yourself or others is I think the point. Right, Berry, that's - and looking at the chat window that's exactly.

Berry Cobb: Okay great, close this one off. Then there are two changes, the addition of other and then the new option that we just discussed.

Okay moving onto Comment Number 6. "I access the Whois information both via Web interface and direct server queries depending on the context. However the survey only allows to select one."

Steve Metalitz: I think this is going to Question 9?

Susan Prosser: Does it?

Michael Young: If it only allows one or the other it should be - there should be a both.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, we just put in both?

Michael Young: Yes.

Susan Prosser: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. Moving on to - and by the way if I prematurely move onto another comment anybody s welcome to raise a hand or let me know and I'll stop.

Moving onto Comment Number 7. This was from Chuck Gomes in the survey tool. "Adding an other box might be a good idea in this question. Which of these best describes the most beneficial use of Whois to your organization? For example VeriSign uses Whois to manage registrar transfer disputes. An other box might be helpful for the last question in this section."

Steve Metalitz: I think we just did that.

Anne Naffziger: That's what we just did, yes.

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...Number 5.

Anne Naffziger: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Great.

Michael Young: And it occurs to me, you know, maybe a little - how did you try and match these comments to the questions, Berry?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. For this one I didn't do this. But as we get down into actual survey questions if it was referring to a specific question I copied and pasted the actual question that it belonged to.

Michael Young: I see.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Okay, yes.

Berry Cobb: I didn't do it on this one.

Michael Young: And did you try and group them together?

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Yes, they are grouped.

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: No they are - it's all grouped by section and - or I guess in order of the questions as they appeared.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Got it.

Berry Cobb: I just didn't do it for this one. And this particular comment was loaded at the bottom of the tool - or I'm sorry, our last question that we made available for each section in the general comments.

Michael Young: Okay.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. Moving onto Comment Number 8. "I would like to see a pre-public service provided for Whois lookups. The service should be accessible via various methods such as Website, DNS lookups, etcetera."

Michael Young: That's a laudable request but it doesn't - does that really have anything to do with our survey? I don't think so.

Don Blumenthal: No, it's Don. I'd put that under out of scope.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. Moving onto Comment Number 9. This was unknown as well. "Number 1. The regions just applies a list of countries. That is a mismatch."

Steve Metalitz: I think that's - this is Steve. I think that's referring to Question 3, which says, "Which region/location do you reside in?" And then there's a list of countries. So maybe we just say which location if we're going to list - we seemed to have list every country - some exhaustive list.

Berry Cobb: Yes, I would agree. Maybe we just remove region and just keep location or do we...

Michael Young: Yes.

Berry Cobb: ...typically state country?

Steve Metalitz: I would avoid that...

Michael Young: Some of those are - sorry.

Steve Metalitz: Some of those - not everyone agrees is a country like...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Exactly. Some of them are considered territories and what have you.

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

Don Blumenthal: And this is Don. Just raising the always (unintelligible) Taiwan a country not...

Steve Metalitz: But it's definitely a location.

Don Blumenthal: Yes - yes.

Michael Young: That's...

Don Blumenthal: And those little political things that continue to baffle me but it's an issue.

Michael Young: Well it's never baffling, Don, when somebody offends us, right? So...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: Okay. "A number of domains question have a blank radio button and one that is no answer just one that says none or zero ." I guess SB is suggested - I'm not sure what that...

Susan Prosser: Should be...

Berry Cobb: Should be. Thank you.

Steve Metalitz: I think this is about 5 and 6 and I think we've already done that adding zero.

Susan Prosser: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Okay. And the third comment is, "I think it d be useful for Web interfaces to find out whether the person answering the survey uses the Whois from 1, a registrar; 2, a registry; 3, general commercial source that aggregates all domains or, 4, internic.net, the ICANN source, perhaps other choices."

Steve Metalitz: I think this is asking for more detail on Question 9. You know, those would be examples of - certainly of Website interfaces and maybe direct server query. I guess the question is...

Michael Young: Well so they re trying to discover who s running, I guess, the Whois service, right?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I read the question as to, you know, which source do you actually access it from like for example I, 99% of the time, will go to domain

tools and then if there's any confusion behind that then I may go to the direct registrar or the registry.

Michael Young: I'm not sure that that applies to the - to gathering or asking questions about the functionality of Whois, that's more about maybe leaning towards who should be obligated to run Whois or offer Whois which I'm going to venture forward and say that's maybe out of our scope.

Don Blumenthal: It's Don. This one troubles me. And unfortunately the fact that the person remained anonymous - I wish there were a way to go back to the person who posted and ask a little more about what he or she had in mind. I can see reasons to ask that question but I - without that I don't know if it really is out of scope or not.

Michael Young: Well and my inclination is to suggest that we deal with the first couple of issues that they raised and then - which is just editorial really - and then on the third one - I don't know that we should take an action without understanding that question better.

I worry that opening that line of questioning goes from asking about the functionality of Whois more towards how you're going to use Whois in regards - from a - like who's operating it and where do you consume it from and so forth which gets into - I worry about that because then you get parties interested in whether or not they should be obligated to run Whois and so forth.

Some parties do feel very strongly about not wanting to have a regulatory obligation to run Whois. And I don't think it would help our efforts to step into any of that kind of fray.

Don Blumenthal: It's Don again. I agree. I guess what, you know, I'm going to try to do some mindreading. I'm wondering if the person who posted the comment was looking at the question the way it's laid out and thought you're only interested

in are you going to a specific mix through the Website or through direction query and that a lot of people basically use neither in this person's view if they use domain tools or something like that. So are we missing the population that does what Berry does and what I do frequently is go to an aggregate.

Susan Prosser: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, I guess that's the question. How should that person be answering the question as it stands now? I would think they would be - they're going to a Website but that Website is then using Port 43.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Well so - maybe we can backtrack and turn this into a - sorry, go ahead, Steve.

Steve Metalitz: I'm just saying that a lot of people answering the survey might not know that.

Michael Young: Yes, I think you'd have to be a pretty experienced user to understand the question. Maybe - I almost think we could turn this into (unintelligible) add more questions. But we could add a version of this as a functionality question. And I think the functionality question that would be valid to ask from this is do you feel a Whois service should be capable of supporting multiple TLDs or singular TLDs? A single Whois service.

Now the reality is knowing how people tend to construct these things, sure it can. But we are asking the question specifically in that case. It's a functionality question if we phrase it that way. Is that...

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Michael Young: Is it worth doing?

Steve Metalitz: That wouldn't be here anyway. This is asking for their behavior now; we're trying to find out something about them. And then the other one is asking really about the main thrust of the survey which is...

Michael Young: Capabilities.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Yes.

Don Blumenthal: It's Don. We've got a parenthetical at the bottom there, that direct server query. Could we add a - something that Website includes direct query or using a third party?

Steve Metalitz: Yes, that's reasonable I think. We could extend that list of answers.

Don Blumenthal: I mean that would clear up the problem and not get us into the quagmire that you were concerned about.

Michael Young: Yes, yes. Does everyone follow what Don's saying is that question where we say direct query or Web-based that we add in an option that says - or a third party service.

Don Blumenthal: No, no what I was suggesting is we added a description along with direct server query that says Website interface could be direct - could be to a registrar, registry, whatever or to a third party although your option is fine too.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, this is Steve. I think I like Don's suggestion which is we're explaining - we're unpacking a little bit more how we want people to answer this. And if we explain to them that Website interface includes both registry/registrar Website or a third party Website then they know that if they go to domain tools they check Website.



Michael Young: Yes, okay. That makes sense.

Berry Cobb: And so this is Berry. If I understood that correctly instead of actually creating an option we would just use a parenthetical after the question describing what was just stated that a Website may include a registry, a registrar or third party access or interface.

Don Blumenthal: It's Don. Yes, given that we have this non-parenthetical approach just for consistency I would probably just put another line above that one rather than parenthetical. But you got the idea.

Michael Young: So in the question body, okay.

Don Blumenthal: Yes, right above that direct server query means the Website interface - interface means.

Berry Cobb: Just so I get the words correctly I'm pasting into the chat the following:  
"Website interfaces include an interface to registry/registrar or third party sources."

Michael Young: Sounds right to me.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Susan Prosser: Yes.

Berry Cobb: All right, very good. Moving onto Comment Number 10. This is from the survey tool. "The operator of a service pointed to by an A record in a zone file is often not the domain owner. When there were 200 domains needing to contact the admin tech about an issue was an important. Now there are 200 million domains with 20 billion end users, public Whois is only used by spammers and scammers to blast out mass email or target individuals with

long-past (unintelligible) retired Whois, the graveyard as it serves no useful purpose."

Michael Young: Well so that's a diatribe.

Steve Metalitz: Thank you for your opinion.

Michael Young: Yes, thank you for your opinion. Exactly.

Don Blumenthal: And as a matter of fact I've seen this before. And if I were to go through my email I could tell you who posted it but I'm not sure it's worth it.

Steve Metalitz: No.

Michael Young: No, let s not go there.

Berry Cobb: Okay I think the same can be - this is probably a error on my part that's just a duplication of Number 10 so I'll delete that row entirely. So now the next one, Number 12, "Registration of domains response is for personal domains. There should be a section for number of registrations if a registrar or registry." I'm thinking that a registry or registry.

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: I'm not sure I understand what that means.

Steve Metalitz: My guess is that - this is going to back to 5 and 6. And if you re a registry and you re filling out this - let s say you re a gTLD registry and you re filling this out how should you answer Number 6? Would you put in there how many registrations there are in your gTLD or would you put not applicable? Because if you have - you know, or a much smaller number because you haven t registered; you - registry company - have only registered a limited number of domains.

Michael Young: Ah.

Steve Metalitz: I'm not sure that - I mean, the question is how would a registry read this question or registrar, same question. A registrar may have 500,000 domain names under management. That's not really what we're asking here.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. What about just adding an option if you are a registry or registrar select here and not answer?

Steve Metalitz: Well they might - the answer for them might not be zero. I mean, if you're Go Daddy you have registered some domain names as Go Daddy; you have godaddy.com and others. So that's the answer...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...looking for, how many have you registered on your own account or...

Michael Young: Well if that's the case, if that's what we're asking, how many you've registered on your own account, then the numbers we have in here are fine. Because, you know, registries and registrars should not be registering large numbers of domains for their own account.

Steve Metalitz: Right but I think - but the question is do we need to clarify the question to say have you registered on your own account or for your own account.

Michael Young: So - sure, why don't we add a line then to exactly that effect in the question body. If you are a registry or a registrar, (note), these are domains directly registered by you - for your own use.

Steve Metalitz: For your own use. On your own account or for your own use.

Michael Young: Yes. Got that Berry?

Berry Cobb: Yes, just clarify. So we re going to add a clarification statement to the question that the scope of registration through this question is that of your own personal use.

Steve Metalitz: Not necessarily personal use but on your - for your own account I think is - it might be the simplest way to express it.

Michael Young: Yes and if you want to get the word use in there just say use don t say personal .

Steve Metalitz: For your own use.

Michael Young: Own use, yes.

Berry Cobb: Okay pasting in here just to be safe. So the scope of domain registrations for this question is for your own use, not if. Is that acceptable?

Michael Young: Okay by me.

Steve Metalitz: I think that's okay. I think we re going to - yes, I think that's right.

Berry Cobb: And definitely certainly once we've made this next round the (unintelligible). And I think internally we re going to review the survey as a whole again. And I'm sure we'll have other changes that may or may not affect some of these to bring them into line.

All right, Comment Number 13. Unknown. "How I really found the survey Twitter post that pointed to ICANN.org for the comments deadline."

Michael Young: Wow, that is a circuitous route.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I'll just - you know, we do have ICANN.org as the - one of the options. Twitter was just a facility to get them to ICANN.org.

Michael Young: Right but they landed at the ICANN.org comments deadline - our deadline specifically or a landing page that shows all the impending deadlines and that's how they found it?

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. ICANN has recently started tweeting out through their handles the opening and closing of public comment forums. And I think just today there was one that was sent out for our Whois specifically. And I believe there were a couple last week that were submitted saying that there were three days remaining and then one day, etcetera.

And the link itself will take them to the actual public comment page for that respective policy topic.

Michael Young: Oh that was fairly direct, okay. That's...

((Crosstalk))

Anne Naffziger: Perhaps that's something we should include then as an option if that is something that ICANN is going to be using heavily. It would be interesting to know, probably, how much impact that's having. It is a way people communicate now. Perhaps an other covers it and they could fill it in. But that's interesting to know that people are getting there that way.

Steve Metalitz: Well, this is Steve. So you re saying we should list Twitter.

Anne Naffziger: Yes or...

Steve Metalitz: Is that what you re suggesting?

Susan Prosser: You could just say social media .

Anne Naffziger: Social media or, you know, and then as an example Twitter or list a couple others. But it seems to me if that is something that ICANN is utilizing then...

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

Anne Naffziger: ...it would be helpful just to know.

Susan Prosser: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: Sure.

Berry Cobb: So this is Berry. If I understand that then we'll just add a direct option of social media or specifically Twitter?

Susan Prosser: I think they do it on Facebook also.

Anne Naffziger: Yes, I would say - this is Anne again. I would say social media and you could do something like including Twitter and Facebook or just say social media. But if you wanted to give a couple examples that might trigger it for folks to, you know, exactly where they would want to put their answer.

Berry Cobb: So I created it just like, social media, Facebook, Twitter, etcetera.

Steve Metalitz: That looks good.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Moving onto Comment Number 14, also from the survey tool. "Tracing spam via Whois has seldom been useful. US spammers can easily hide behind disposable corporations so even non-bogus contact information is a dead end. Whois is much more useful for identifying ISPs and legitimate users who have an interest in working contact information. Also most individuals I know use privacy service specifically to avoid spam harassment pointed out their registered Whois contacts. While most corporations use

some generic admin email@thedomain.com which may or may not ever be answered."

Michael Young: Again that sounds like an opinion piece.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: Great.

Berry Cobb: Noted. All right moving into the substance now which is Section 2. Comment Number 15 and (unintelligible) on the PDF. "The first option seems to repeat the question." Now again all of these, if I recall correctly, were taken from the general comment section just because some of the specific questions didn't have a comment period. And so I think we're going to have to investigate as to which question they may be referring to.

Steve Metalitz: They might be referring to Question 16 because that actually - the first button is a repeat of the question. Maybe that's the mistake here. Have a direct need for this list of Whois servers.

Don Blumenthal: Oh, good point.

Berry Cobb: So the action will be to remove the first option.

Steve Metalitz: And, you know, the last one looks a little garbled to me on this document. Maybe it's been fixed on the actual survey. But, "Yes we would use a - this list the below reason."

Susan Prosser: It's the same on the survey.

Steve Metalitz: Is it? Okay well saying yes, we would use this list for the reason below.

Susan Prosser: But then the comment box needs to follow it exactly. Right now on the actual survey it's more of a comment not an answer to the reasoning. I'm not sure if that makes sense to you guys. But it doesn't flow on the actual survey.

Michael Young: That makes sense.

Don Blumenthal: This is Don. Just jumping back which version of the - do you have the direct need? Are we removing the one, if part (unintelligible) or do we leave the option in the question?

Steve Metalitz: The option because that's just a question that's not an answer.

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry.

((Crosstalk))

Don Blumenthal: Yes, all right I've got the flow, you're right. Sorry.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. And how do we want to handle the last option again?

Steve Metalitz: I'm not sure what we intended there but I thought it was - it meant yes we would use this list for the reason below and then you put that in your comment box. But I think someone said that doesn't really work on this survey.

Susan Prosser: Yes, the format of the survey - the comment box becomes basically two columns. And so maybe in removing - and Wilson can probably play with the formatting of the survey itself. But the comment box ends up at the top of the next, you know, column. So it doesn't really flow with that radio button.

Berry Cobb: How about we just reword it: "Yes, we would use this list for the reason stated in the comment box."



Susan Prosser: Perfect.

Berry Cobb: Or...

Steve Metalitz: Yes. Sounds good. This is Steve.

Michael Young: Guys, I have to step away for two minutes. I'll be right back.

Berry Cobb: I've already kind of changed the wording on that. I'll - let me paste it in here and get a sanity check.

Susan Prosser: I would probably not specify where (are you) located because Wilson may change the format of the question and the table, for my opinion and this is Susan.

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: ...just shave off the - to the right.

Susan Prosser: Oh, yes, we just need a comment box and then Wilson has the free will to put the comment box wherever he would like it. That makes sense in the survey tool.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. All right moving along to the next - or Comment Number 16. "The first item can be dropped." And I'm assuming that they're also referring to Question 16.

Steve Metalitz: Yes, I think so.

Berry Cobb: Okay moving onto Number 17. "The possible answers are non-exhaustive. What's wrong with the existing..."

Michael Young: I'm back...

((Crosstalk))

Berry Cobb: We're on Number 17, Michael. "The possible answers are non-exhaustive. What's wrong with the existing referral mechanism? Also the idea of having some sort of list outside the DNS seems, frankly, insane."

Steve Metalitz: I think this might be going to Number 17 but I'm not sure. I think his first comment is - really - suggests that maybe we need other as an option.

Michael Young: This is Comment 17 we're looking at right now?

Berry Cobb: Yes.

Steve Metalitz: And I think it goes to Question 17.

Michael Young: Okay. I can think of - it's awfully strongly worded comment. But okay. Looking at 17 on the Adobe, right?

Berry Cobb: Yes. And the second statement almost seems that it refers to 16 by my read but I might be mistaken.

Steve Metalitz: Maybe you're right.

Michael Young: Well, if you're following the WEIRDS group discussion that last one is starting to become better (unintelligible) than it was originally. But I don't know, I mean, it just sounds like someone express so I don't think we really need to change the question. It's just someone's strong opinion.

Steve Metalitz: Well if we - I think - this is Steve. I think Berry's right. I think this is really about 16 - Question 16 - about the list of servers. And I think he's saying the list is - the list of answers is not exhaustive because status quo - an option is - well what if we, you know, we have a sprinkling of yes and no with

explanations here. But what if just had a button that said no for the reason stated in the comment box?

And then this person would say no we don't need that because the existing referral mechanism is deficient. Would that...

Michael Young: Well we have a yes, we would use this list for the below reason, which is actually - it needs a little editing there - so why wouldn't we have a no, we would use this - we wouldn't want this for the following reason...

Steve Metalitz: Yes.

Michael Young: ...as well? And I think you're right.

Steve Metalitz: That would cover this person's turn.

Berry Cobb: So if I understood that correctly is we simplify it, a simple yes or no and then state that they need to make a comment of what their choice would be?

Steve Metalitz: No I think...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...we're talking about adding another button that says no for the reason stated in the comment box.

Berry Cobb: Oh okay, all right. Thank you.

Michael Young: We only need one comment box, right?

Steve Metalitz: Right, right.

Michael Young: It would just say - yes. Unless, you know, someone was of two minds.

Steve Metalitz: Then they have to throw out...

((Crosstalk))

Steve Metalitz: ...twice.

Berry Cobb: So the - in terms of the text itself is, "No, we would not use this list for the following reason."

Steve Metalitz: For the reason stated in the comment box. Same as the one you just did.

Berry Cobb: Okay. Great, good deal. Okay, moving onto Number 18. "For the purpose of the survey review critique the first answer option should be removed. Do you have a direct need for the list of Whois servers?" And I think we've already covered that one.

The survey question is broken. "Do you have a direct need for the list of Whois servers as a response?" I think we covered that. "I usually use Web-based Whois services but as the registry/registrar community has diversified they become much less reliable and often have to hunt down the correct registrar to get information typically using that registrar's Web interface when it's not broken, which it often is. Having the list directly accessible would make it much easier to get reliable results."

Michael Young: So that sounds like a survey answer. Okay.

Berry Cobb: And I think we've covered the other option, confusion.

Okay moving onto Number 19. "The TLD.whois-servers.net subdomain C names could be used for Port 43 lookups while the Whois.nic.tld naming convention could be used for Port 80 Web-based lookups."

Michael Young: Well that's just an implementation suggestion so that's nice but it's really, you know, it's not relevant.

Berry Cobb: Okay and moving onto Number 20. "The Whois templates of each Whois server should be the same. It is okay to disclose data but the template should always be the same especially if you're running your own Whois server because of thin registries."

Michael Young: All right that's another comment. I don't know that we need to change any of our questions on that.

Berry Cobb: And...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Sorry, go ahead.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. I was just going to move onto the next one.

Michael Young: Yes.

Berry Cobb: Okay. And the last one for Section 2. "These questions are for technical users." We're going to see this repeated - I believe it's almost in every section. And the user that submitted these most of them - I think most of the responses he said were for technical users but there are a couple of comments in there stating that they're for nontechnical users. I - really I think the only thing we can state here is noted and no action or acknowledged.

Don Blumenthal: That's Don. That's true but it does kind of pick up on some things we heard in Webinars and in some one on one discussions in Prague which is - raised the issue of whether we should be flagging sections or rearranging so that people of different skill sets could focus more closely on what - on their expertise.

I mean, that may just be an organizational thing we can deal with after we go through all these things. But that general question came up in different ways.

Michael Young: I think, I mean, why don't we talk about that after we get through all the questions because there's - in that - I had some specific comments from Chuck Gomes as well.

Don Blumenthal: Yes.

Michael Young: Along...

Don Blumenthal: Chuck's one of them who made the point.

Michael Young: Yes, I think he wrote it down but also, you know, he verbally made it clear that, you know, there's likely to be - require multiple resources within a given organization to answer the entire survey if they're keen on answering it.

Don Blumenthal: Right. Okay.

Berry Cobb: And this is Berry. I'm just making a note that we'll review this at the conclusion of the public comments review for future change.

Michael Young: You know, one thing - so we just don't lose it, Berry, while I'm thinking about it, maybe in each of the survey sections we should have, you know, a jump button that says skip this section and then it also in each section a button that says something like I've had enough, complete the survey as is so that we know people didn't necessarily abandon it but they - like because they got distracted by something or whatever but they deliberately just said that's enough for me.

Berry Cobb: Okay I've taken note of that.

Michael Young: Where we can see that they deliberately skipped an entire section because it too technical maybe for them or whatever.

Berry Cobb: I agree.

All right moving onto Section 3. I believe that we had this call scheduled for two hours - no, an hour and a half so we only have about 10 minutes remaining. Michael, I know that you wanted to kind of perform chat a little bit but we should...

Michael Young: Well...

Berry Cobb: ...also maybe talk about our future schedule as well where we...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Yes, well - why don't we just cut off now then rather than go right - we tried to schedule - squeeze in two calls didn't we - Berry, we talked about this because we thought it would take longer than one call to finish going through these?

Berry Cobb: Definitely. Well in terms of our overall milestone schedule we've kind of - I mean, we haven't committed to but we were targeting the end of July to submit the final survey or make it available for use. And then that would run for 30 days. That would take us basically into the end of August and beginning of September. And by the end of September we had released the survey results and by the end of October publish the final report.

Given how quickly we moved through these today certainly I think the more substantive comments are in the upcoming sections. So it may even take two more calls for us to review through the rest of these comments. Might I suggest certainly that we maybe move to a weekly schedule if not at least maybe a two-hour schedule to move these forward.

Michael Young: Well I'm okay personally with a mix of different things. We could do a - we do need to keep on schedule so we could do a weeklies for a couple of weeks or we could try and - what if we did - what if we tried for two hours on the 23rd and then revert back to our regular schedule on the 30th of an hour and a half?

That would give us four and a half hours of - sorry, am I doing my math wrong? Probably. Yes, three and a half hours of working time between now and the end of July. It should allow us to finish going through these and have some free form discussions.

Berry Cobb: I concur.

Michael Young: Okay. Is everyone else okay with that?

Don Blumenthal: It's Don. I was kind of distracted by the other phone. Could you - I got the thing about the 23rd but I missed - yes...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: We're basically inserting one extra meeting on the 23rd for two hours to help us stay on schedule. So is that possible for everyone?

Don Blumenthal: Twenty-third and then what's the other one? Thirtieth?

Michael Young: Then we go back to our regular schedule, yes, which would be the 30th.

Don Blumenthal: Okay. Just for what it's worth I'll be in Kiev. I'll try to participate but I don't know if I can on the 30th. But next Monday is fine.

Michael Young: Okay.



Steve Metalitz: This is Steve. I'm not able to participate next Monday but that would probably be true whether it was an hour and a half or two hours. I might be able to come in toward the end.

Michael Young: Okay. Well can we do this? We'll push ahead with those meetings and for those of us that can't make the meeting can they review the notes afterwards because Berry is taking notes of the action items and see if they have anything to add, you know, work through it on the list and see if they have anything to add or disagree or agree with, that sort of thing.

Steve Metalitz: Sounds good.

Don Blumenthal: Okay.

Michael Young: Okay. All right...

Wilson Abigaba: Excuse me. Yes, excuse me.

Michael Young: Wilson, go ahead. Yes.

Wilson Abigaba: (Unintelligible) action items before the next meeting?

Michael Young: Yes. Berry, can we review the action items?

((Crosstalk))

Wilson Abigaba: No, no, (unintelligible) but implementing them on the survey tool.

Berry Cobb: This is Berry. Absolutely. I think by the end of the day I'll send out a revised public comment review tool that'll have all the notes that I've taken for the day. And if there's an action within the fourth column - recommended action - the working group has agreed to that change so I wouldn't see why we couldn't go ahead and make those changes on the fly.

Wilson Abigaba: Oh okay.

Berry Cobb: And, Wilson, one other comment I think with respect to the survey tool unless the working group has a different opinion but at the bottom of each section we had made the free form text, "If you have any other comments, suggestions, clarification about this section please enter them here." Does the working group feel that those can probably be removed to help kind of minimize the size of the survey when we go live with this?

Wilson Abigaba: Yes, (unintelligible) for this draft (unintelligible). But for the latest (unintelligible) they won't be there. They (unintelligible) one at the end of the survey.

Berry Cobb: Okay great. All right I think, Michael, in terms of action items the only action item we have so far is just to get next version of the comment tool out and Nathalie will get the calendar entries set up and the next meeting scheduled for us.

Michael Young: Perfect. Okay great, thank you. So let's go to new business. We're going to have our open discussion after we get through the structured exercise that Berry's put together. But is there anything else that anyone wants to bring up?

Wilson Abigaba: Okay now another solution, Berry, could you please send us these comments? And if possible - is it possible can we get like (unintelligible) can share and next time (unintelligible), for example can share the (unintelligible) conference call. (Unintelligible).

Michael Young: I couldn't understand, Wilson, there sorry. It was too muffled for me.

Wilson Abigaba: Okay. I was saying that Berry could send us these comments so that we review them during the week. And...

((Crosstalk))

Michael Young: Right.

Wilson Abigaba: ...(unintelligible) on Google Doc so that we make some comments (unintelligible) that by the time of the conference call we have - we already made our comments and spend this time on the call.

Michael Young: Sure. So let me recap what I think you're saying, Wilson, which is Berry's already agreed to post the comments that - the action items that he's gathered today. You're saying post the document - he sent that document around to us in Word. You're saying post it in Google Docs so we have a common document and then can everybody in advance put their thoughts together as to the upcoming comments before we actually get on the phone so that we have a chance.

I mean, ideally I think that would be great. I think realistically we won't get a whole lot of pickup. And the best way to get people to eyeball these things and think about them is to have them on a call together.

Berry Cobb: Right. And this is Berry. Per the working group guidelines we have to review these comments together as a team. That's not to say that we can't all go individually do our homework up front and know what comments we're going to state for each particular - or what response we would state for each comment. But we are required to review through them together as a group and deliberate and discuss the response and action.

Wilson Abigaba: Oh okay, okay. It's understood. (Unintelligible) can just have the comments (unintelligible) look through and then we shall discuss them together during the conference call.

Berry Cobb: Absolutely. I'll be sending out the next version at close of business today.

Wilson Abigaba: Oh okay, thank you.

Berry Cobb: So, Michael, I think that's all that I have.

Michael Young: Thanks, everyone.

Steve Metalitz: Thanks.

Susan Prosser: Thank you.

Berry Cobb: All right have a good day.

((Crosstalk))

END